

**From:** [Banipal, Ben](#)  
**To:** [Hah, Josephine](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Region 6 Response to April 24, 2018 Meeting Follow-up Request  
**Date:** Friday, May 4, 2018 2:38:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Thanks, Josephine

---

**From:** Hah, Josephine  
**Sent:** Friday, May 04, 2018 2:23 PM  
**To:** Bond, Matthew R <BondM@gao.gov>; Solomon, Ruth <SolomonR@gao.gov>; normane@gao.gov  
**Cc:** Villarreal, Chris <villarreal.chris@epa.gov>; Banipal, Ben <banipal.ben@epa.gov>; Gee, Randy <Gee.Randy@epa.gov>; Turner, LaDonna <turner.ladonna@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Region 6 Response to April 24, 2018 Meeting Follow-up Request

Matt,

In response to your April 24, 2018 request, please see the attached documents (red). We have started our records search of the 21 sites identified as having no tribal interest. We should have more information to provide by next Friday.

Below you will find the follow ups from today's meeting and follow-ups from these previous meetings:

- 1) Agenda from RTOC meetings where potential opportunities for tribal consultation was discussed for the Wilcox Oil Company. Alternatively, if you have emails or other documentation to demonstrate that consultation was offered, that would suffice. Attached Cherokee, MCN, and SF Tribal consultation invitation letters regarding the Wilcox Oil Company Superfund site. R6 RTOC Report-November 2017.
- 2) Copies of the two letters from the Grants Mining District offering consultation to the Pueblos that did not make it into TCOTS. Attached Pueblo of Acoma and Pueblo of Laguna consultation letters. We could not locate letters that were dated.
- 3) A copy of the tribal risk assessment for the North Railroad Avenue Plume Santa Clara Pueblo Draft Tribal Environmental Assessment Document
- 4) Documentation, if available, on the Region's offering consultation to tribes associated with the 21 sites within the data Region 6 officials reviewed in December 2017 that are on or near tribal reservations that did not elicit Native American interest in consultation. If possible, provide documentation of the tribal response as well. (We can provide a list of the sites indicated, if needed).

As promised, attached you will find the Superfund FAQ forwarded us by OITA that we referenced in the phone call.

Below are follow-up items we requested from previous meetings. If these documents have been sent previously, either in whole or in part, please forward the documents to me and I will save them and confirm receipt.

Follow-ups from December 15, 2017 ROI:

1. Attendance list – Received 24 April
2. Example of an administrative record for Tar Creek which shows informal coordination with the tribe.
3. Examples in the Tar Creek administrative record showing documented change to site boundary because of EPA's move to a watershed-focused approach.

Follow ups from December 7, 2017 ROI on Jackpile Paguate:

- 1) Attendance list – Received 24 April
- 2) Chronology and documents or letters indicating coordination with Laguna Pueblo. Jackpile Timeline of Events
- 3) Memo talking about fishing on the Pueblo lands. Ref. 23 Fishing Memo
- 4) Examples of cultural awareness stipulation from Pruitt Site work plan.
- 5) A copy of the Laguna Pueblo MOU with EPA. Laguna MOU signed

If you have any questions please let me know. Thank you.

**Josephine Hah, CPA**

Accountant

Office of the Regional Comptroller

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6

☎: 214-665-9780

✉: [Hah.Josephine@epa.gov](mailto:Hah.Josephine@epa.gov)

